



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sensualiter is there set down in opposition to Berengarius's spiritual presence, not in the Capharnaite\* sense of the word; for we have proof positive it could not, as the good bishops then had. One of our senses hears the word, "this is my body," and we believe it sensibly [aye, burns into the very soul]. This sense hears, the word was made flesh, and we believe it true, and so of all the great dogmas of Christian belief; and I may ask by what other channel does religion come to us but by this sense of hearing? What has the feeling of touch to do with it, the sense of smell to do with it, or sight, or taste? We hear and believe—and this is said to be Protestant doctrine.—Fact number two disposed of.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We ask our correspondent to consider the purpose for which we called on Roman Catholic controversialists "to deal with infallibility as a matter of fact; has the Church of Rome, in fact, been always infallible?" Putting the question thus does not imply that men can be infallible judges of the truth or falsehood of what God reveals. It does not "make Christ a criminal."

But all men do and must form some judgment, one way or the other, whether the Church of Rome be really infallible or not. And we think that every man who undertakes to support either side of the question, may fairly be required to say whether he does actually believe in the practical truth of that which he tries to support in argument. "Philaethes" brought forward the decision of Pope Nicolas II., and his 113 bishops, about Berengarius, as an infallible decision. We put it to "Philaethes" to say, "did he really believe that decision of Pope Nicolas II. and his council to be true and infallible?" and "Philaethes" has never ventured to say that he does believe it to be infallible. We call that dealing with infallibility as a question of fact; and we cannot see how it "arraigns the Holy Scriptures before an historical tribunal," or "makes Christ a criminal."

Our correspondent, however, undertakes to answer on two matters of fact; and his doing so does seem to us to prove, that he does not really feel that method of argument to be so very impious and wicked as he states it to be.

First, He enters, in a long argument, to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism. But in that argument he never once alludes to the main document, which we produced—namely, Pope Liberius's own letter, in which he condemns Athanasius, and professes communion with the Arian bishops. We give that quotation here again:—

"I do not defend Athanasius . . . when I knew that you had justly condemned him, since it was pleasing to God, I afterwards supplied my consent to your sentence; and, in addition, I gave letters to be brought to the Emperor Constantius, by our brother Fortunatianus, concerning him (Athanasius) by name—that is, concerning his condemnation. Therefore, Athanasius being removed, all your decrees concerning whom will be revered by me, together with the Apostolic See, I say that I have peace and unity with all of you, and with all the Eastern bishops, and through all the provinces."†

Our correspondent undertakes to prove that Pope Liberius did not give in to Arianism: but he does not venture to notice this letter.

To make this matter plain to him, we call his attention to the fact that the Emperor Constantius, to whom Pope Liberius wrote to say that he had condemned Athanasius, was himself an Arian, bent on establishing Arianism in the Church. Was that the man to whom a Pope should write, "That he had condemned Athanasius?" And the Eastern bishops, to whom the Pope wrote that letter, and with whom he professes to be now in peace and unity, were also Arians! Was this not becoming an Arian?

But to help our correspondent a little more to understand that letter of Pope Liberius, we give him here the opinion of Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne, upon that letter. Our readers will remember that this Binius was the man who tried to defend the forged epistles when all others were giving them up; and they may be sure he would not give up the case about Liberius, if there was any chance of being able to deny it. And here is what he says on that letter:—

"This is that true and genuine epistle of Liberius, which, being basely and shamefully overcome by the tediousness of exile, and the fear of death (after two years of exile, and Felix being substituted for him in the pontifical see), he wrote to the Easterns, signifying that he approved the sentence given against Athanasius by their suffrages—that he admitted the Arians to his communion, and approved as Catholic the confession of faith published at Sirmium."‡

In that same place, Binius quotes (among other ancient testimonies) St. Jerome, speaking of the matter thus:— "Liberius being conquered by the tediousness of exile, subscribing to HERETICAL pravity, entered Rome as a victor."§

Where, note, that St. Jerome says nothing of the fear of death; for which, indeed, there was no ground: it was exile that made Liberius subscribe to heresy; and, subscribing to heresy, enabled him to triumph as Pope, over his rival.

It was but natural that our correspondent should avoid noticing a letter which even Binius could only notice with such a confession; but our correspondent must try his hand again, if he would prove that Liberius never fell into Arianism. And we beg of our correspondent not again to overlook that letter of Pope Liberius, which tells us about it.

2nd. Our correspondent undertakes to answer for "Philaethes" (which "Philaethes" has not attempted to do for himself), about the confession which Pope Nicolas II. and the Roman Council compelled Berengarius to sign. We stated, that the Pope and Council compelled Berengarius to say—that the true body and blood of Christ was "in a sensible manner (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Our correspondent does not deny that they said this, and made Berengarius say it; but he asks, "Can you contend that the bishops meant nothing else?" Well, in our simplicity, we thought an infallible tribunal must mean what it said. Just consider the position of a Church, with an infallible tribunal, liable to say something quite different from what it meant! In that case, every man must judge of the truth for himself before he can venture to hear the infallible tribunal; and when he hears it, he must be prepared to say, "This infallible tribunal has said what was wrong; it must have meant something else." Surely, such a tribunal would be a snare, and not a help.

Just take this instance. The tribunal said, that the body of Christ is, "in a sensible manner, handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." Oh, no! says our correspondent, the tribunal meant to say, "that it is the sense of hearing which hears the word, 'this is my body!'" So, if you change every other word in the sentence, then the great word sensualiter may safely and properly stand in the sentence, but not otherwise. For our part, we would rather seek for the meaning of the Word of God, than have to make such wild guesses at the meaning of an infallible tribunal which cannot even say what it means.

Our correspondent concludes thus:—"I may ask, by what other channel does religion come to us, but by this sense of hearing? What has the feeling of touch to do with it?"

We answer this from the Douay Bible (Luke xxiv. 39), where our Saviour said to his disciples who doubted about the truth of his resurrection, "HANDLE and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have."

We hold this up to our Roman Catholic readers, as a solemn warning, that they who undertake to maintain the evidence of transubstantiation, are driven to deny the proof on which our Saviour himself placed the fundamental doctrine of his religion—even his own resurrection!

#### POSTSCRIPT TO "PHILAETHES."

It was our correspondent "Philaethes" who first brought forward in our pages the case of Berengarius and the infallible decision of Pope Nicolas and his council. Four letters of "Philaethes," on this subject, were received and inserted by us in the past year:—1st, in January, page 9; 2nd, in July, page 81; 3rd, in September, page 104; 4th, in November, page 129. In our observations on the last two, page 105, and page 130, we called on "Philaethes," in the plainest terms, to answer this question:—"Does he think that the Pope and council were right, or does he think that they were wrong?" He has not answered this; and both our December and January numbers have now appeared, since we last called on him to answer, without our getting any reply to this question.

It does strike us as very strange that "Philaethes" should produce the judgment of a Pope and Council, as a decision that must be true, and yet that, when we ask him "does he really himself believe it to be true," he should not have one word to answer.

We now beg, in a friendly manner, to represent to "Philaethes" the appearance which his correspondence must present to ourselves and others, if he allows it to come to an end in so unsatisfactory a way.

What can we or our correspondents think but this—that while "Philaethes" was actually arguing for the infallibility of Pope and Council, he had in his own mind a secret consciousness that both Pope and Council together were fallible and wrong?

What can we think of his last letter, but that he was striving to throw dust in other people's eyes, to prevent their seeing what he himself did feel—that Pope and Council together are fallible and liable to err?

Sorry should we be to think this of any of our correspondents. We do not think it yet; we know what allowance is to be made for men; we know how far theories may impose on us, till we come to test them by facts. But we do, in a friendly and earnest manner, represent to "Philaethes," that the only way he can now free himself from this appearance of insincerity, is to come forward and state in our pages, whether he think Pope Nicolas II. and his Council were right or wrong in the confession which they compelled Berengarius to sign. Our pages are open to him still, to set himself right.

#### ON DEFECTS IN THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I do not know whether I should attribute to ignorance or intention the numerous errors concerning the celebration of mass which are to be found in "Talk of the Road," No. XIX., which appears in your December number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. It will be generally allowed, that among the members of the Catholic Church no doubt or hesitation is felt as to the efficacy of that holy sacrament as it is presented to their faithful view. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that those who wish to turn them from their religion use their best endeavours to inject doubts and scruples into the minds of the ignorant and unwary, as to the sublime truth contained in this capital doctrine of the Catholic faith—the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the mass, as they see it daily administered. But, to the point. In the latter part of this "Talk of the Road" Mr. Burke ("missioner"), is represented as drawing out of his pocket a Roman Missal, at a controversial class meeting, and handing it to a certain Mickey Reilly, a "very learned man," as the story tells; but, surely, a very ignorant man, as the sequel will show, with the request that he would read out for the meeting, into English, that passage of the rubric concerning defects in the celebration of mass, which states that wax candles should be present. The words are—"Si non adsint luminaria cerea." It is contained in article X. of the rubric, the title of which is, "De defectibus in ministerio ipso occurrentibus." This passage produced a great effect on Mickey, and still greater on the meeting; for we find, according to the report, that one Barney Daly stated that, often as he had heard mass in the poorhouse he could not be certain whether it was a mere wafer or the true sacrament he worshipped; nay, rather, he might be sure of the contrary; for the opinion of the meeting, and of the learned Mickey Reilly, sanctioned by the missionary, was, that if wax candles were not present, "the sacrament is not made at all." Now, this missionary had either read the rubric, or he had not. If the latter, he was guilty of great presumption in taking the Missal out of his pocket at all. If the former, I will show that he was guilty of great dishonesty in leaving his poor hearers under a great delusion. I shall have to trouble you, sir, and your readers, to attend to a somewhat lengthy quotation from the rubric. It is, in fact, the preface at length. "Sacerdos celebraturus, omnem adhibeat diligentiam, ne desit aliquid ex requisitis ad sacramentum Eucharistiae conficiendum. Potest autem defectus contingere ex parte materiae consecrandae, et ex parte formae adhibendae, et ex parte ministri conficientis. Quidquid enim horum deficit, scilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione, et ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente, non conficitur sacramentum. Et his existentibus quibuscumque aliis deficientibus, veritas adest sacramenti. Alii vero sunt defectus qui in missae celebratione occurrentes etsi veritatem sacramenti non impediunt, possunt tamen aut cum peccato aut cum scandalo contingere." Of which the following is a literal translation:—

"Let the priest about to celebrate use all diligence, that nothing be wanting of those things which are required to make the sacrament of the Eucharist. A defect can occur in respect of the matter to be consecrated, in respect of the form to be used, and in respect of the minister who performs; for, whatever of these be wanting, to wit, the proper matter, the form with intention, and priestly order in him who performs, no sacrament is made. Yet these (viz., three conditions) existing, although certain other things be wanting, the true sacrament is present. There are other defects which may occur in the celebration of mass, although they do not hinder a true sacrament; when they do happen, they must be called a sin or a scandal."

From this, then, it appears, that the conditions essential to a true sacrament are—1st. "Materia debita;" 2nd. "Forma cum intentione;" 3rd. "Ordo sacerdotalis in conficiente." In the tenth article of the rubric, there occurs the mention of a great number of defects, in the lower sense of the word, which cannot occur in the celebration, without great offence or culpable negligence on the part of the priest. Among these occur wax candles. "Si non sint luminaria cerea." I have no doubt, nor can any sensible Catholic have a doubt, that tallow candles, or "dips," as they are contemptuously called, would, under the exigency of the case in question, here answer as well as wax, for the service of the mass to the faithful poor.

Having stated the case, and its refutation, without touching on other topics in No. XIX., on which much could be said,

I remain, sir, your obedient Servant,

A CATHOLIC.

We think our correspondent quite right upon the point of the candles. We think that the word "defect," is used in the rubric of the mass, for things that do prevent transubstantiation taking place, and also for things that do not prevent transubstantiation taking place. And this double use of the word in that rubric has led other Protestants into an error, as well as Mr. Burke, the missionary.\*

We have often invited Roman Catholics to correct any erroneous statement about their religion that may appear in our pages; and we thankfully accept at their hands any such correction. We are sure that it will give confidence and satisfaction to our readers to see, that what we publish

\* See supra, page 6.

\* Sic. in MS. Query Capharnaite?

† Labbe and Coss., vol. ii., p. 751. Ed. Paris, 1672. The Latin was given in our number for December, p. 142, col. 3, note.

‡ Hec est vera illa et germana epistola Liberii, quam tedio exilii mortisque metu turpiter et ignominiose superatus, post exactum biennium Exilii, felicemque in sede pontificia subrogatum, scripsit ad orientales, significans se latam contra Athanasium sententiam non suffragio comprobare, Arianos ad communionem admittere, editamque Sirmii professionem fidei, velut Catholicam approbare.—Given by Labbe and Cossart, in the place referred to above.

§ Liberius tedio victus exilii, in hereticam pravitatem subscribens, Romam quasi victor introivit. Same reference.

is thus carefully watched, and corrected, when we do publish anything requiring correction. They will then know that what stands uncorrected and unquestioned may be relied on.

We think the notion among Protestants, of the necessity of wax candles at the mass has arisen latterly from the general demand made for them from the Boards of Guardians of workhouses, since Protestants called attention to the necessity for them.\* And hence it was too hastily assumed, that the object of their anxiety was to remedy a "defect" that was fatal to the mass, and not merely a "defect" which only involved (to use our correspondent's own words) a "great offence or culpable negligence on the part of the priest." And sufficient care has not always been given to ascertain the precise value of the "defect" from "the rubric of the mass," which certainly is not the simplest document in the world.

Having now frankly admitted the error which appeared in our pages (as we shall always be ready to do), we ask our correspondent to consider as frankly the real effect of the correction of such an error; we ask him to do so, because he seems inclined to build more on it than it can carry. He seems to take for granted, that he has now proved "that among the members of the (Roman) Catholic Church, no doubt or hesitation is felt (or need be) as to the efficacy of that holy sacrament, as it is presented to their faith." Now, we frankly admit, that (if transubstantiation be really true, and if the rubrics of the mass may be relied on with DIVINE FAITH) no Roman Catholic need have any doubt or hesitation, so far as the candles are concerned. But is it still a question, whether they ought not reasonably to feel some doubt and hesitation upon other points, as to what it really is to which they give divine worship?

Our correspondent is evidently a perfect master of this rubric, and we beg to ask his opinion on the following case. Suppose that the wine used was not really made of grapes (de vite), or suppose the wine had been made from sour or unripe grapes (de uvis acerbis, seu non maturis expressum), is the sacrament "made" in that case? We expect our correspondent will admit, that in such a case the bread is not changed into the body of Christ, and the wine is not changed into the blood of Christ. In that case, then, the people give to mere bread and wine "the worship of Latria, which is due to the TRUE GOD."† Now, what knowledge have the people whether the wine was made from grapes that were ripe, or from grapes that were not ripe? or whether the wine was made from grapes at all? They cannot judge of that for themselves, for they are never allowed to taste the wine. They must trust to the priest for that. Can they be sure of his judgment? They do not see the priest taste it until after he has consecrated it. Can they be sure that the priests, who have committed "great offence or culpable negligence" about the candles, did always taste the wine? And if the priest did taste the wine, is every priest an infallible judge of the fact, whether the grapes, from which that wine was made, were really ripe or not? We believe it to be a fact (and we mention it only as a fact, and not as an offence), that the usual beverage of an Irish priest is whisky-punch; and that many of them seldom taste wine in their lives. How can they be judges of whether the grapes were ripe or not? It is also notorious, that most of the wine sold in country towns in Ireland was never made of grapes at all, but concocted in this country. And this manufacture is brought to such perfection, that even a good judge of wine cannot tell, with certainty, whether it is made of grapes or not.

How is the wine provided for mass in the workhouses? We believe it is generally paid for out of the rates, and purchased by the master's boy in the next shop in a country town; a shop in which, perhaps, no wine really made of grapes was ever sold.

Yet, our correspondent must confess, that if that wine be not really made of grapes, and of ripe grapes, too, the people at mass in the workhouse are giving divine worship to a mere piece of bread and wine.

And now, we ask, what degree or kind of certainty is necessary, that the bread and wine are really turned into the body and blood of Christ, before we may worship it? Will any certainty less than DIVINE FAITH be enough? And if it be necessary to have divine faith that this change has really taken place, then is it not necessary to have the certainty of divine faith, that the wine was really made of ripe grapes? And how can any one have "divine faith" that the wine bought in a country shop was really made of "ripe grapes"? And if he cannot have this, how can he have "divine faith" that that wine is really turned into the blood of Christ? And if he have not this, how can he have "divine faith" that it is really "the body, and blood, and soul, and divinity of Christ" that he is worshipping? And if he have not this faith, how can his worship be an "act of faith"?

Let it be remembered, what Roman Catholic controversialists say to Protestants: "You can never make an act of faith (they say) because you have not divine faith that the Bible is the Word of God; and when you have not divine faith for the first step, you cannot have it for

any after." Now, we ask Roman Catholics to consider, can any Roman Catholic have as much faith or certainty, that the wine, sold in a country shop, was made of ripe grapes, as a Protestant has, that the Bible is the Word of God? If not, what certainty can a Roman Catholic have, that that wine is really turned into the blood of Christ? We invite our correspondent to answer this question, and to set us right, if we are wrong.

Our readers will, of course, understand, that we do not say this as if we believed transubstantiation to be true. Our object is to inquire, what certainty Roman Catholics have, even if transubstantiation were true, that the change has really taken place at that particular mass at which they worship?

This is only one particular, out of many, out of which doubt may arise; but one is enough at a time, and we ask our correspondent to solve it.

## DOES THE CHURCH OF ROME ENCOURAGE THE HOLY SCRIPTURE?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I take the liberty of troubling you for a few moments respecting a subject which you have again and again stated in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and supported by proofs (or asserted proofs), derived from (professedly) the authorized edicts of the Church of Rome, and the statements made by her ecclesiastics—among the rest, by Cardinal Wiseman, in his tract, which was analyzed in your columns in June and July last, the subject being the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in Roman Catholic countries, which you have said (sustained, as stated), is forbidden, and, as much as possible, prevented. I am led to these observations by the perusal of the *Weekly Telegraph* for November 17, 1853, in which the subjoined assertions are made, and which are impossible to be reconciled with yours, so contradictory do they appear:—

The *Weekly Telegraph* says—"In no Catholic (Roman?) country is there a law against the circulation of the Scriptures. In every Catholic (Roman?) country the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged. It is a gross, &c., invention to assert the contrary. D'Aubigne asserts that there was no version of the Bible in the German language previous to the time of Luther. There was an Italian version made by Nicolai Malerle in 1471, another by A. Buccioli in 1523, and that is promoted by all means within the command of the Church, of Popes, Cardinals, &c., &c., an Italian version by Anthony Martini, a version which received the sanction of Pius VI., and that has been printed times innumerable!! (?)". The editor certainly qualifies his statements by the following:—"The circulation of the Scriptures, however, is a very different thing from a circulation of a perversion of the Scriptures." Diodati's version is, according to the Rev. Dr. Dixon such a one. He says, "Calmet observes, that in the same way as in his French Bible, Diodati's has rather given a paraphrase, than a version in the strict sense." As I, by all means, desire to elicit truth, will you be pleased, if possible, to refute this, and give clearly the proofs, on which it can be based—your former statements of the withholding of the Bible from the people in their own language, in Roman Catholic countries, and a contradiction of the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph's* assertions, as quoted above. Or, if you have already made the subject clear, by referring to the places.

I am sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM MURPHY.

Our correspondent's desire to be furnished with proofs of the anxiety of the Roman Catholic Church to withhold the Scriptures from the people in their own language may be very easily gratified. We begin with the rule laid down by the order of the Council of Trent, which may be regarded as the most authoritative standard of the Church of Rome, in this as well as other matters.

The Fathers of the Synod ordered that an index of the prohibited books should be laid before the then Pope, Pius IV., who approved of it, and it was published with the rules placed at the head of it, as by the orders of the Council itself. The fourth rule was as follows:—

"Whereas, it is manifest by experience, that, if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be allowed indifferently to any body, there will, on account of men's rashness, arise from hence a greater detriment than advantage . . . if any one, without a license, presume to read or keep by him the Bible, he shall be disqualified to receive the absolution of his sins, till he deliver it up to the ordinary."—*Regule Indicis S.S. Synodi Tridentinae jussu edita, De libr. prohib. reg. 4.*

This does not look very like an "encouragement of the circulation of the Scriptures," which the Editor of the *Weekly Telegraph* asserts to prevail in all Roman Catholic countries. But, let us hear Pope Clement VIII's annotations on this rule of Pius IV.:—

"This law is not to be so understood as if by it the bishops, inquisitors, or heads of convents were invested with power to grant licenses to read, buy, or keep the Bible translated into vulgar language, seeing hitherto, by the order and practice of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition, the power had been taken away from them, to grant licenses to read, or keep the whole Bible in the vulgar tongue, or any other part of the Holy Scriptures, of the old or new Testaments, published in any vulgar lan-

guage, even not so much as the summaries or compendiums of the said Bibles, or books of the holy Scriptures, translated into any vulgar language; all which is to be inviolably observed."

By the fourth rule of the Index, a bishop or inquisitor had power, in certain cases, to give a written license to read the Bible; but here we see, that by this interpretation of Clement VIII., a bishop has in reality no such power, and that if a Roman Catholic wants permission to read the Scriptures, or even a summary or compendium of the Scriptures, in his own native tongue, the bishop cannot give him leave, but he must seek it from the "Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition." After this decision of Clement VIII., we need not wonder to find a prohibition in the Index of "all Bibles penned in any vulgar language whatsoever" (biblia vulgari quocunque idiomate conscripta); and yet, according to the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, it is a gross invention to assert that the Church of Rome does not encourage the circulation of the Scriptures!

That the Council of Trent really intended to prohibit the promiscuous reading of the Holy Scriptures appears further from the most authentic writers. Alphonsus a Castro, who had been one of the members of that assembly, says expressly (Lib. i. contr. Har. c. 13.) that "one of the parents and springs of heresies was the translation of the holy Scriptures into the vulgar language, and, therefore, bestows great praises on the edict of Ferdinand and Elizabeth, king and queen of Spain, by which they had forbidden, under the severest penalties, either to translate the holy Scriptures into the vulgar languages, or to keep any translation made of them, under any pretence whatever." Sixtus Senensis says plainly, that "to allow shoemakers, fullers, &c., to read the Scriptures, is to give that which is holy unto the dogs, and to cast pearls before swine." Cardinal Bellarmine, the great oracle of the Roman Catholic Church, writes as plainly as he well can to the same effect. "We maintain," says he (speaking, apparently, the settled doctrine and opinion of his Church on this point) "that the Scriptures ought not to be read publicly in the vulgar tongue, nor allowed to be read indifferently by everybody." (Quod contendimus est, non debere publice legi lingua vulgari, nec passim omnibus permitti legendas Scripturas lingua vulgari. *De contrav.*, tom. i., p. 70. Prag. 1721).

We are well aware that the Gallican Church has held that the rules of the Index, which place a restriction on the circulation of the Bible, were never received in France by public authority, and are not generally binding. But, upon this point, it will be sufficient to quote the opinion of Dens, who was for a long time, and is still, for aught we know, the standard authority at Maynooth. "According to Steyneret," says he, "the law (i.e. the fourth rule of the Index) was received and observed (with some variety, according to the peculiar genius of nations) in by far the greatest portion of the Catholic world, nay in the whole of that part of the world which is completely Catholic. It was more dispensed with only where Catholics lived among heretics." (Solum ubi inter hæreticos degendum fuit, plus in dultum est. Dens vol. ii., p. 103).

We believe that in this passage Dens has, unwittingly, told the true state of the case, or, to use the vulgar phrase, "has let the cat out of the bag." As long as the Church of Rome had all the power in her own hands she placed restrictions and prohibitions on the reading of the Scriptures; and these restrictions are only relaxed where heretical Protestants will not let her have altogether her own way.

The last authority which we shall quote, is one which we think even the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph* will find it hard to disavow. Cardinal Wiseman, in his "Catholic Doctrine of the use of the Bible," a book published only last year, writes as follows (page 20):—

"If, therefore, we be asked why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all, and the shutting up of God's Word be disdainfully thrown in our face, we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunt by denial, or by attempts to prove that our principles on the subject are not antagonistic to those of Protestants. They are antagonistic, and we glory in avowing it." This passage, we think, needs no comment.

We think we have said enough for the present to enable our correspondent to satisfy himself of the truth or falsehood of the assertion of the editor of the *Weekly Telegraph*, that "the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged in every Roman Catholic country." We hope to take another opportunity of adverting to some other parts of his letter.

## ON DR. CAHILL'S ATTACK ON THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Your Roman Catholic readers may have seen a letter signed D. W. Cahill, D.D., in the *Tablet* of the 17th ultimo, which charges the Protestant Church with the shameful crime of "mistranslating, subtracting" from "and adding to the most important passages of both the Old and New Testament." Happily the writer descends from generalities, and selects, as a proof, one text—viz., Matt. xxvi. 26, from the authorized or Protestant version of the Holy Scriptures, by which he hopes to establish his sweeping charge. A failure, then, in his proof in this text which

\* We are ourselves acquainted with several members of Boards of Guardians who were present when the Roman Catholic chaplains made the demand for wax candles. And all these demands were made much about the same time.

† Latria cultum, qui vero Deo debetur.—Council of Trent, Sess. XII. chap. 5.